

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 48-73, 75-104, 106-126 and 152-164 are presently pending in the application. Claims 48-73, 75-104, 106-126 and 152-164 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for being indefinite.

In particular, the language “the dispenser adjusted to dispense a volume of solution in a single coupling step of less than 5 nl when positioned a distance away from a localized area” in claim 48 and 152 stands objected to by the Examiner as being unclear. The Examiner has helpfully suggested amending the claim to recite “wherein the apparatus is operative to dispense a volume of solution in a single coupling step of less than 5 nl when positioned a distance away from a localized area” to overcome the rejection. In response, the applicants have amended the claim in the format suggested by the Examiner, however, the applicants have recited “wherein the dispenser is operative to . . .” as the amended limitation refers to a dispenser.

Also, the Examiner has requested clarification as to how the claim language “when positioned . . . relates to the positioning system. In response, applicants have amended the claim to delete “when positioned” and to insert “at”.

The Examiner has requested clarification of the use of “a support” at claim 1 line 11. In response, applicants have amended “a support” to “the support”.

The Examiner has requested clarification of “individual localized areas” at claim 1 line 11. In response, applicants have amended “individual localized areas” to “the individual localized areas”.

The Examiner has requested clarification of how the “solution of compound” relates to the ligands arrayed. In response, applicants state that further dependent claims recite that the compound is a polymer or monomer and further dependent claims identify certain polymers or

monomers. Claims 48 and 152 recite that the positioning system be capable of positioning the dispenser (which is operative to dispense a volume of solution of a compound) until an array of ligands is formed. The claim requires that the eventual compound resident at a localized area be a ligand.

The Examiner has requested clarification of claims 53 and 153 insofar as it recites a method step. Claims 53 and 153 have been amended to recite that the dispenser is operative to contact the support in a manner similar to that suggested by the Examiner with respect to claim 48.

The Examiner has requested clarification of the language "the dispenser is adjusted to" in claim 125. In response, applicants have amended claim 125 to recite "the dispenser is operative to repeatedly dispense droplets no greater than 5 nl to the same or a different localized area" in a manner similar to that suggested for claim 48.

Having addressed all outstanding issues, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

October 13, 2004



John P. Iwanicki, Reg. No. 34,628
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
28 State Street, 28th Floor
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 720-9600